

A

RESOLUTION

Of three Important Questions (pre-
mis'd as a Foundation to an intended
Exposition of the fourth and fifth
Chapters of the *Apocalypse*) in An-
swer to the late Reverend and Learn-
ed Dr. H. M.

Wherein is shewed,

- I. *That the Fourth and Fifth Chapters of the Reve-
lation, are properly a Prophecy of things to come to
pass after St. John's receiving of the Vision of them.*
- II. *That by Opening of the Book, Rev. v. is meant, or
prefigured the Explaining of it.*
- III. *That by the Throne in both the said Chapters, is
meant a Throne of God on Earth, and not in the
highest Heaven.*

By W. G. V. T.

Printed in the Year, 1688.

Lord Crew's
Charity



Durham, England

A

account
an Ex
lation
thoug
the m
these
M. T
what
ticula
very
plain
and
contr

W
she fi
ry T
self,
to pa
with
Paral
Nove
bad n
presly



THE P R E F A C E.

AS to this little Treatise (the Smallness whereof would easily be excus'd, if it were not also of it self imperfect, as design'd in order only to some other thing) I desire the Reader to take this following account. It is now more than four Tears ago, since I wrote an Exposition on the fourth and fifth Chapters of the Revelation, and communicated it to some certain Friends, whom I thought best able to make a right Judgment of it; who, for the most part, modestly excusing their unacquaintedness with these Studies, advis'd me to impart it to the famous Dr. H. M. To him therefore I dispatch'd it; who, quite contrary to what I imagin'd, finding very little to say against the Particulars of my Exposition, set himself wholly to overthrow the very Foundation on which I built; and which I thought so plain, that no body could have oppos'd it. In short, the main, and (in effect) the only things that he objected, were the contrary Propositions to what I here assert in these Papers.

Whereupon, about the end of February 1684. I put forth the first of these three Sheets; wherein I prove from the very Title prefixt to those very Chapters by the Spirit himself, that they are properly a Prophecy of things to come to pass after St. John's receiving the Vision; which Dr. M. with great earnestness had denied in the xxist Chapter of his Paralipomena Prophëtica (a Book which he put forth about November 1685, after he had seen my Exposition) but he had never taken notice, that the SPIRIT himself has expressly entitl'd it a Vision of future things, which was in-

The PREFACE.

deed a very great Oversight in the Doctor. So I thought that my putting him in mind of this, would easily put an end to the Dispute between us; there being nothing to be said against so plain a Demonstration. And indeed my Expectation did not fail me, for from that time to this, I have never had a word of Answer from him; which, in effect, was yielding up the whole to me, that I contend for in these Papers. For if those Chapters be A Prophecy of things to come to pass after St. John's receiving of the Vision, they were not either past, or present, at that time. And consequently, the Opening of the sealed Book, which St. John then saw, must be a Type of the explaining of it afterwards (for it prefigures that most naturally, and can prefigure nothing else) and also the Throne which he saw at the same time, must needs be a Throne of God which was afterwards to be on Earth, and cannot signify his Throne in the highest Heaven, which existed before all Ages. Altho to make all as sure as I could, I have prov'd these things by many other Arguments in these Papers. It is therefore highly to be presum'd that the Doctor would in all this time have defended his Book against that first attempt of mine, if it had been possible; but since he has not done it, we may well conclude, that as his Modesty would not suffer him to confess his Error, otherwise than by Silence, so it would much less allow him to engage in defence of it. I lately hear, that since (viz. in August last) God has taken him to his Mercy; and let his Memory be ever precious. I hope it will be no Offence to those that have a just esteem for it, if, before I publish my said Exposition to the World, I undertake to clear those Points in difference between us, upon which I am to lay so great a stress; and which if I am not able to make good, it would be vain to meddle any further in this business.

June vii 1688.



A VINDICATION of certain Papers (not yet made publick) concerning the Exposition of the fourth and fifth Chapters of the Revelation, (the right understanding of which Chapters would be of the greatest advantage to the Church :) from the Exceptions of the Reverend and Learned Dr. H. M.

THere is no Vision in the whole Book of the Revelation that has been less understood hitherto, than that of the 4th and 5th Chapters; and yet there is none has been expounded with more ease to those that have undertaken that Task, than those Chapters have. For tho there be many Objections both very weighty, and very obvious, to be made against the Expositions of every one of them (for they all agree as to the main, in a literal kind of way of interpreting them (such as any Child that is but just come to the use of Reason, would be apt at first sight to pitch upon) concurring unanimously in one grand mistake, That by the Lamb's coming and taking the Book out of the hand of him that sat on the Throne, Rev. 7. is represented God's giving his Son the Revelation; tho there be many Objections, I say, both weighty and obvious, to be alledg'd against this way of expounding, yet no Man, tho never so learned, ingenious, or curious in these Speculations, has so much as mention'd one of them, till the learned and ingenious Dr. M. being urg'd by some Papers I sent him a while ago, has been pleas'd both to insert the Objections into his *Paralipomena Prophetica*, Chap. xxxiv. and to give us his Solutions of them. It is a glorious Vision, as any one may see by the bare letter of it; which made me, while I look'd upon it only by the Light which I receiv'd from others, never to read it over without a Sigh. For I could perceive nothing from their Expositions, but what is deliver'd much more plainly in other Scriptures: and I could not by any

means persuade my self that so magnificent a Vision as this is, was written only to inform us, how obscurely and mysteriously common Truths, well known before, plain, easy, and familiar, might be represented.

I hope no Man will be so uncharitable as to interpret the design of what I have here said, to be as if I meant to disparage other Interpreters, to most of whom for any commendable Quality I am no way comparable. For as I honour every Man that with so much as but a good intent has seem'd to have bestowed his pains in explicating these Mysteries: so I ingenuously profess that nothing but the love of Truth has mov'd me to lay open the seeming Inconsistencies of their Exposition. In order to the manifesting of which Truth, when it shall be thought fit by those that are the Judges of what is fit in such cases; I shall now only endeavour to prepare the way, by shewing that which the Reverend and Learned Dr. M. is forced to deny at any rate, as being utterly inconsistent with his own and the common Hypothesis, viz. *That the Vision of the fourth and fifth Chapters of the Revelation is properly a Prophecy; and consequently, that the design of the fifth Chapter is not to represent God's giving to his Son the Revelation.*

That the fourth and fifth Chapters of the Revelation are a Prophecy. This appears so plainly from the Preface that the Spirit himself has prefixt to them, that one would think it impossible for any Man to be mistaken in this Point. *After this I looked* (says St. John, Chap. iv. 1.) *and behold a Door was opened in Heaven; And the first Voice which I heard was as it were, of a Trumpet talking with me, saying, Come up hither, and I will shew thee things which must be hereafter.* Is not this as plain an Indication as can be desired, that the things which St. John was now about to see, were things to come; and consequently, that the seeing of those things is prophesying? But what were those things which the Voice shewed him? What can they be, if not those which immediately follow, of which St. John gives this Relation, ver. 2, 3, &c. *And immediately, says he, I was in the Spirit, and behold, a Throne was set in Heaven; and one sat on the Throne, &c. And round about the Throne were four and twenty Elders sitting, &c. and out of the Throne proceeded Lightnings, and Thundrings, and Voices; And there were seven Lamps of Fire burning before the Throne, &c. And in the midst of the Throne, and round about the Throne were four Beasts, &c.*

who

who rest not day and night, saying, *Holy, Holy, Holy, &c.* And when those Beasts magnify him that sat on the Throne, the four and twenty Elders with profound humility give God the Glory of the Works of his Creation. Then in the fifth Chapter he proceeds to tell us how that the *Sitter on the Throne had a Book in his right-hand, written within, and on the back-side, sealed with seven Seals.* Whereupon a strong Angel is seen proclaiming with a loud Voice, *Who is worthy to open the Book? &c.* ver. 1, 2. *None in the whole World is found worthy,* ver. 3. Wherefore St. John weeps, ver. 4. One of the Elders comforts him, ver. 5. Whereupon St. John espies in the midst of the Throne a Lamb standing as if it had been slain, &c. ver. 6. who came and took the Book out of the right-hand of him that sat on the Throne, ver. 7. Upon which the said Beasts and Elders fall down before the Lamb, and sing a Song to him, congratulating his taking the Book, and opening the Seals, ver. 8, 9, 10. Then the Prophet hears the Voice of many Angels round about the Throne, and the Beasts, and the Elders applauding the Lamb, ver. 11, 12. And next he hears no less than every Creature in Heaven, Earth, Sea, and under the Earth, giving Blessing, Honour, Glory and Power to him that sitteth on the Throne, and to the Lamb. The four Beasts saying *Amen*; and the Elders doing most profound reverence also, ver. 12, 13. -- Then he proceeds in Chap. vi. 1, 2, &c. to tell us what he saw in the Book when the Lamb had opened it. *And I saw* (says St. John) *when the Lamb opened one of the Seals, and I heard as it were the noise of Thunder; one of the four Beasts saying, Come and see. And I saw, and behold a white Horse, and he that sat on him had a Bow, &c.* And in like manner he goes on, describing what he saw at the opening of each Seal. — Now the thing which I affirm is this, That whether the things which St. John saw in the Book, be a Prophecy of future things or not; yet it must needs be that the many other things which he saw and heard before the opening of the Book, are a Prophecy. The reason is plain; because those words of the Voice [Chap. 4. 1. *I will shew thee things that must be hereafter*] do most plainly and immediately affect the things which he saw in the fourth and fifth Chapters; but not those things which he saw in the Book, Chap. 6. Nor does this only appear from the order of Narration, but also from the reason and nature of the the thing it self. For those words of the Voice [*Come up hither, and I will shew thee things that must be*

hereafter] must necessarily refer to the things which the *Voice* shew'd him, viz. those things which he saw by virtue of his being call'd up into Heaven; which things are plainly *the Throne*, with *the Sitter on it*, together with the other things afore-spooken of. But as for the things that were contained in the *Book*, he was not shew'd them by the *Voice*, but by the *Lamb* that opened the *Book*, and the *Beasts* that called him to see them; as appears most evidently from *Rev. 6. 1, 2, &c.*

Besides, the Title of [*things that must be hereafter*] is not adequate to the Visions of the sealed *Book*; whose Events (even according to Dr. M's own Exposition) begin as soon as those of the Epistolar Prophecy. As therefore the Title to the Epistolar Prophecy is [*things that are, and things that must be hereafter, Rev. 1. 19.*] because, as the Doctor truly affirms, the Epistles concern the state of the Church then present, as well as that which was to come; why should not the Prophecy of the sealed *Book* have the same Title, since the reason in all points is the same? So plain is it every way, that those words of the *Voice* [*Come up hither, and I will shew thee things which must be hereafter*] respect not the Visions of the *Book*, Chap. 6. but those that immediately follow the said words in Chap. 4. 2, 3, &c. viz. the Vision of the *Throne*, and the rest that follow.

If therefore the Vision of the *Throne*, with the *Sitter on it*, the *Elders* and *Beasts* praising him, the *Book* in the *Sitter's* Right-hand, the *strong Angels* proclaiming, &c. I say, if these things be not some of those which the *Voice* points at, *Vers. 1.* telling the Prophet he would shew him *things that must come to pass hereafter*, it will be impossible to prove that any part of the *Revelation* is a Prophecy. *Come up hither* (says the *Voice*) *and I will shew thee things that must be hereafter.* And immediately (says the Prophet) *I was in the Spirit, and saw such and such things.* And are not they the things then which the *Voice* said he would shew him? Which things, since the *Voice* says they are future things, or *things that must be hereafter*; it is plain the Vision of them is a Prophecy.

But notwithstanding this mighty Evidence of Truth, the Reverend Dr. M. is pleased to express his Wonder (in his *Paralipomena Prophetica*, Chap. xxi.) that any Man of Wit, and Parts, and Learning should be so heedless and grossly mistaken, as to make it a

Prophecy

Prophecy properly so called, &c. Whereas he that has but the least judgment in the World, must needs see (if he will not wilfully wink) that the Spirit himself stiles it a Vision of *things to come*: And therefore if the Spirit speaks *properly*, the Vision is *properly a Prophecy*. But let us hear what that Learned Person urges in defence of his own Opinion. Now the substance of what he alledges in the said Chapter is this: "That the Vision of the fourth and fifth Chapters of the *Revelation* is no more a Prophecy, than that in *Ezekiel* the first; to which also it is very like in many respects: as that of *Ezekiel* is to the glorious Representation of the God of *Israel* made to *Moses* and the Elders in the Mount, *Exod.* xxiv. wherefore as neither that which *Ezekiel*, or *Moses* saw, was a Prophecy: So neither is it likely that that which St. *John* saw is a Prophecy. It is only, or chiefly intended for an *Introductory Vision* to the Prophecy of the sealed Book, which begins Chap. 6. 1. (a thing usual with the Prophets, as may be seen *Isa.* 6. 1, 2. &c. *Ezek.* 1. *Daniel* 10. 5, &c.) and no more a Prophecy than those in *Isaiah*, *Ezekiel*, or *Daniel* are, intimating the Divine Inspiration of *John* in writing those Prophecies, and setting forth that in pompous and magnificent Expressions, which is noted in a more vulgar stile, *Rev.* 1. 1. viz. That God gave his Son the *Revelation*. To this I answer; It is here taken for granted that the Vision which *Moses* and *Ezekiel* saw in the places afore-cited, is not a Prophecy; which ought to be clearly proved before any stress can be laid upon it. But suppose it to be no Prophecy (for I cannot spare time for cavilling) will it thence follow that the Vision of *Rev.* iv. & v. is no Prophecy, only because in some things it agrees with that Vision of *Ezekiel*, i. e. it seems to borrow some of its Types from thence? Are not all Interpreters generally agreed, that the Types in the *Revelation* are mostly borrowed from Stories, Rites, and Constitutions of the Jewish Church, and taken out of the Old Testament, as well the Historical as Prophetical Parts of it, and yet no Man denies it to be a Prophecy? For Example, do not both Mr. *Made*, and your self also in several Particulars resemble the Prophecy of the Woman, *Rev.* xii. 1, &c. to the History of the Children of *Israel* in *Egypt*, and coming out of it, *Exod.* i. and in the following Chapter? And yet you never doubt of its being a Prophecy ere the more for that.

But

But further, There is a vast difference between the Vision of *Ezekiel* and *Moses*, and that of *St. John*, *Rev. iv. & v.* in that this latter is entitled by the Spirit himself, [a Vision] of *things that must be hereafter*. Now if these, or the like words be not prefix'd to that Vision of *Ezekiel*, *Moses*, or that of *Daniel* either aforementioned, how can it be thought good reasoning, to say, those Visions are no Prophecies, therefore this is none ?

I expected the Doctor should have clear'd this point, (*viz.* the Argument hitherto insisted on from those obvious words, *Come up hither, and I will shew thee things that must be hereafter* ; which are the most apposite in the World to prove the Vision immediately subsequent, to be a Prophecy) but I find not the least notice taken of it.

But because the Doctor insists much upon its being an *Introductory Vision* to those of the sealed Book ; as if it could be no Prophecy, if it were an Introductory Vision.

I answer, by granting it to be an Introductory Vision indeed ; but no otherwise Introductory, than the Prophecy of the Sealed-Book introduces that of the Trumpets, *Chap. viii.* or than that does the Prophecy of the Opened-Book (as the Doctor loves to call it) *Chap. xi. 1, &c.* Or than the Vision of the Vials, *Chap. xvi.* introduces that of the Beast, *Chap. xvii.* As one *History* may introduce another ; so one *Prophecy* may introduce another ; What should hinder ? But now, If by an *Introductory Vision* be meant a *Preface* ; there is no other such as I see, than that of *Chap. iv. 1.* where the Voice calls *St. John* to him, saying, *Come up hither, and I will shew thee things that must be hereafter*. This I say is all the *Preface* that I can find ; for in the very next Verse begins an account of the things themselves, which the Voice promis'd to shew him ; *viz.* a Prophetical Representation of a glorious Church, with a particular Description (in the likeness of an History) of the Beginning, Progress, and Accomplishment of the Opening of a certain Book, whose Contents are particularly described, *Chap. vi.* and those that follow. So that here is *Prophetia in Prophetia*, *i. e.* the Prophecy of the Book it self, contained in the Prophetical Relation of the opening of it. As if it had been said thus : Hereafter shall arise a Church like that described *Rev. iv.* wherein a certain Book shall be open'd by the Lamb, in such manner and circumstances as are described, *Chap. v.* containing such and such things as are said to have

have been seen in it in the sixth and following Chapters. Now in such manner of speech as this, who does not see that the Description of the Church, and the manner of opening the Book is *introductory* of the things contained in the Book ; and yet is as properly a Prophecy, as that contained in the Book is ? To which Prophetical History of the opening of this Book, those words, [*Come up hither, and I will shew thee things that must be hereafter*] is the only Preface. By which, and by his adding immediately after, that *he was immediately in the Spirit*, upon the speaking of these words to him ; St. John's Divine Inspiration in writing this Prophecy, is sufficiently intimated.

But whereas the Learned Doctor further asserts, That the fifth Chapter is added, *for the setting forth of that in more pompous and magnificent Expressions, which is done but in a vulgar stile*, Rev. i. 1. that *God gave his Son the Revelation* : this being a Stone that most Interpreters have stumbled at, I endeavoured to remove it by demanding several things, the attentive Consideration of which would give great light to this whole matter in dispute. And the Doctor has done me the honour to set down the Queries themselves, as he had them from me in Manuscript, with his Answers to them, in the 34th Chapter of his *Paralipomena*. Which Answers, tho I am not at all satisfied with, unless it be that I am much the more confirm'd by them in my former Opinion : Yet I shall not here bestow that needless pains of shewing the insufficiency of them. For so long as that Assertion stands good, which I have been hitherto proving, *viz.* That the fourth and fifth Chapters of the *Revelation* are a Prophecy of things to come to pass *hereafter*, it cannot be that they should be taken up in setting forth God's giving to his Son the *Revelation* ; which was done *before*. Notwithstanding, Sir, if you do not think that I have clear'd this Point sufficiently yet ; if you desire it, I will make it my next business, God willing, to give you all the satisfaction I can, by shewing one by one that my Queries, or Objections, do still remain in their full force, notwithstanding all that you have said to them. But I would not willingly engage so deep against a Person, for whom I have so singular an esteem. And as for that which I have here ventur'd upon, I desire your Pardon, with your most candid and charitable Interpretation of it.

F I X I S.



That
pl
m
bi

H

stand
Dr.
Point
F
ofte
S
Th
F
the
to t
Sea
Da
xii
Bo
unc
the
op
op
tur
m
m
be
m
de
it



II.

That by opening the sealed Book, Rev. v. is meant Explaining it. And that by the Throne there, is meant a Throne of God on Earth, and not in the highest Heaven.

HAVING prov'd in the former Sheet, That the Vision of the fourth and fifth Chapters of the *Revelation*, is properly a Prophecy of things that were to come to pass after the exhibiting of it to St. *John* (notwithstanding what has been alledg'd to the contrary by the Learned Dr. *H. M.*) I proceed now to shew, concerning the other Points in dispute between us,

First, That by that Phrase of opening the sealed Book, so often us'd *Rev. v.* is meant or prefigur'd the explaining of it.

Secondly, That by the Throne, *Rev. iv. 2, &c.* is prefigur'd some Throne of God on Earth, and not his Throne in the highest Heaven.

First, That by opening the Sealed Book is meant, or prefigur'd the explaining of it. For the truth of this Proposition, I appealed to the constant and unquestionable use of that Phrase of opening a Sealed Book, where-ever it occurs throughout the Scripture. As *Dan. ix. 24. Seal up the Vision* (*viz.* that it be not opened) and *xii. 4. Seal the Book even to the time of the end.* Also by the sealed Book, *Isa. xxix. 11.* is meant a Book which no Man could open, or understand. Also that opening of Prophecies signifies explaining them, appears from *Luke xxiv. 32.* where Christ is said to have opened the Scriptures; and *Acts xvii. 3.* St. *Paul* is said to have opened and alledg'd (*viz.* out of the Prophecies of the Scripture) that Christ must needs have suffer'd. Whence the Argument is plain, That if by Sealing a Prophecy be constantly meant in Scripture concealing the Sense of it, so that altho it be written, and in every Man's Hand, yet none knows what it means; and if on the other side, by opening a Prophecy consider'd as sealed or mysterious, be constantly meant explaining it; it is all the reason in the World, that it should be so expounded

in the place we are upon, as it is in all other places.

To this the Doctor answers in the xxxiii Chap. of his *Par. Prophetica*, by distinguishing between opening a Book, and opening a Text. To open a Book, is to unclasp it; to open the Text, is to explain it. And thus it is one thing to open a sealed Book where the Prophecy is, and another to open a sealed Prophecy; which is evident from *Luke* iv. 17. where ἀνατίθειν, which sometimes signifies to explain, signifies only to open a Book of Prophecies, or to expose the Writing to view; which, says the Doctor, is the case here of the seven-sealed Book, as appears from *Rev.* vi. where the opening of the Seals is exemplified, and the meaning shew'd to be only the exhibiting to *John* so many particular Visions, but not the explaining of those Visions.

Reply 1. The Lamb is said *Rev.* vi. not barely to have opened the Book, but to have opened the Seals of it. Now the Seals of a Book are always upon the Text; for we no where read of a Book sealed any otherwise than in respect to the mysteriousness of it. The Seals of a Book are not such as may be broken with the Finger, or cut off with a Knife, or mall'd with an Hammer (if the seven Epistles indeed had been said to have been sealed, we might have had more reason to have fancied them such) but which yield only to the judgment and understanding of the pious Reader, through the assistance of the Spirit of God. And this the Doctor grants, while he shews himself very willing, but as little able, to produce one instance to the contrary. But now if the Seals be always upon the Text, then the Lamb's opening of the Seals in the Vision, must needs figure the opening of the Text, which the Doctor grants to be explaining the sense of it. And (since I have before proved the Vision to be a Prophecy) it appears from hence that it is a Prophecy concerning the explaining of the sealed Book; in which the Lamb opening the Seals to *St. John*, and shewing him the inside Writing, is a Type of Christ, or of his Church, that should afterwards explain the meaning of it to the Faithful. 2. The Doctor in his *Apoc. Apocalypses* on *Rev.* v. 1. grants the Seals of the Book to signify its *Arcana*; and whereas the Book is said to have been written within and on the back-side, the Doctor there expounds the inside Writing to be the *inward Sense* of the Book, in opposition to the literal sense, which is the back-side writing. Whence it must undeniably follow, That to open the Seals of the Book, so that the inside-writing may be seen, is to shew the inward sense of it; or, which is all one, to explain it.

Where

Wherefore as to what the Doctor says of the Lamb's opening the Seals *Rev. vi.* that it is only the exhibiting certain Visions to *St. John*, but not explaining them (from whence he peremptorily concludes, that whatever in other places may be meant by opening the Seals of a Book, it cannot be understood here of explaining it) ; I answer, The Doctor to maintain a literal sense of this Phrase of opening a sealed Book (the sense which he is so zealous against in other cases) is pleas'd to make himself extremely ignorant in a point of ordinary cognizance. For why, I beseech you, Sir, may not Christ's explaining the inward sense of this Book at some time or other to his Servants, be fore-signified by the Lamb's opening the Seals of it in the Vision and shewing the inside-writing of it to *St. John* ? The Doctor grants the Lamb to represent Christ ; *St. John* to represent the People of God (upon *Rev. v. 4.*) he grants the inside-writing of the Book to signify the inward sense of it (in the place a little afore quoted.) What is it, then that he denies ? Why, tho' he grants all this singly, yet he denies, when put together, that the Lamb's opening the Seals and shewing the inside-writing to *St. John*, signifies Christ's explaining at some time or other to his People the inward Sense of the Book. Which, how unreasonable a thing it is, I leave to the judgment of any impartial Reader.

It is therefore to me one of the greatest Wonders in the World, that the Doctor who cries up the *Apocalyps* for a Book so thoroughly *symbolical*, that he will by no means allow *Hail-stones* or *Earthquakes* to be interpreted literally (See *Par. Proph.* Chap. *xlvi.* p. 444.) should be here so stiff for the literal sense of opening the Seals of a Prophetick Book, which (as God would have it) has no literal sense at all. But certainly one would be surpriz'd, who has heard to what a degree the Doctor both derides and pities *R. H.* of *Salisbury* (Epilogue to *Apoc. Apocalypses*, p. 297.) for doting on the literal sense of the *Apocalypse*, to find him caught in the same snare himself, and become as zealous an *R. H.* — as the Gentleman he oppos'd, even in a Type or Symbol which is never known to have been us'd in such a sense. For a further Confirmation of the Sense of which Phrase, I will instance but in one plain case, which we have *Dan. xii. 4.* where the Prophet is commanded to seal the Book even to the time of the end. For if opening the Seals of a Book be no more than exposing the bare words (without sense) to view ; how can the Book of *Daniel* be said to have been sealed to the time of the end, when the words of it have been visible from

the time of his receiving them? If you say, That opening the Seals of a Book may signify only exposing the bare words tho not in that place of *Daniel*: I desire but what is very fair, That you would shew me then some other place, where the Phrase signifies what you contend; or else confess that you have err'd about it.

But if it could be shew'd (which I believe can never be) that opening the Seals of a Book is somewhere found to have a literal sense; yet such a sense not only would be dissonant from the stile and genius of the *Apocalypse*, but in the Vision we are now upon, impossible to be true. For in the literal sense the Seals were open'd by the Lamb in the presence of St. *John* 1600 Years ago, at the time of his seeing this Vision; whereas I have before manifestly proved this Vision to be a Prophecy of things that were to come to pass after. From whence it follows that the Representations made to St. *John* in it, (whereof that of opening the sealed Book is the most insisted on of any) are meerly symbolical, and to be consider'd only as Images of those future things.

Moreover there are two other things which make the literal sense of the Seals open'd in St. *John*'s time impossible. One is, That no such loud Proclamation was ever heard before that opening, as is expressly said to have been made before the true opening of them, *Rev. v. 2. I saw* (says the Prophet) *a strong Angel proclaiming with a loud voice; Who is worthy to open the Book, and to loose the Seals of it?* And this Proclamation is represented as made in the hearing of all the World, as plainly appears from the Return given in upon it in the next Verse, *viz.* That no Man in Heaven, in Earth, or under the Earth, was able to open the Book, &c. Whence we may certainly conclude, that if no Man living in St. *John*'s time did ever hear any such Proclamation made, then was not that which is meant by opening of the Seals, transacted in St. *John*'s time. For it seems very absurd to infer that no Man was able to open the Book, because upon loud (or publick) Proclamation made, no Man appear'd to do it, if no Man then in being ever heard the Proclamation.

To this Dr. *M.* answers, That the Proclamation was never made but only in Vision (*Par. Proph. Chap. xxxiv. Resp. ad prim.*) And he there also gives this reason why it was not needful to be fulfill'd, because the Vision is Dramatical, *i. e.* in the nature of a Stage-play. And he explains his Sentiments of the Vision yet more clearly Chap. xxi. p. 189. *lin. 19.* where speaking with respect to the Vision in *Rev. iv, & v.* he tells us that it is the privilege

ledg
Shows
So tha
Revel
and fo

To
much
be, a
has p

2.
I desi
and t
tells
Sitter
Jesús
that
Dran
whom
part
the
ther
Visio

Be
this
a rea
for t
Show
some
pres
after
of n
only
not
on,
Visio
clai
from
end
cal;
Doc
pret

ledg of the Angelical Kingdom that they can exhibit Prophetical Shows or Plays, when we Mortals can exhibit only Historical Ones. So that according to this account, the ivth and vth Chapters of the *Revelation* are a Play or Show exhibited by the Angelical Kingdom; and for that reason there needs be no completion of them.

To this I reply, 1. That I have prov'd those Chapters to be as much a Prophecy, as any part of the *Revelation* can be prov'd to be, and that from the clear Testimony of the Spirit himself, who has prefix'd the Title of *Things that must be hereafter* to them.

2. If *Rev. iv.* & *v.* be a Play that was really acted in Heaven; I desire to be inform'd, 1. Who acted the Sitter on the Throne, and the slain Lamb, which are the chief Parts in it. The Doctor tells us (*Par. Prop.* Chap. xxxiv. about the beginning) that by the Sitter on the Throne is meant God, and by the slain Lamb, Christ Jesus. But it were absurd to say, either that they act Plays, or that any Creature acts their Parts. Therefore the Vision is not Dramatical. 2. It is manifest that those under the Earth (by whom the Doctor on the place understands Wizards, &c.) have a part in this Play too, as may be seen *Rev. v.* 3, 13. But none of the Angels in Heaven could have such a part put upon them, therefore the Vision is not a Play acted by Angels, but like other Visions prefigurative of things to come.

But now as to the reason why, there needs be no completion of this Vision, *viz.* because it is Dramatical; this is so far from being a reason of it, that (if it were true) it would be a good reason for the quite contrary. For, 1. How can this be a Prophetical Show or Play (as the Doctor calls it) if it be not to be fulfill'd in some real thing to come? 2. It is the nature of all Plays to represent real things; so far is it from all reason to imagine a Play acted by Angels to be only a Fiction, as the Proclamation we speak of must needs be, if it were never made, nor to be made, but only in the Vision. 3. If the Vision of the Angel proclaiming, needs not to be punctually fulfill'd, as being a part of a Dramatical Vision, since it is certain and confest by the Doctor himself that the Vision of the opening the Seals (whereof that of the Angel proclaiming, is part) reaches to the end of *Rev. xi.* It will follow that from the first mention of the opening of the Seals, *Rev. v.* to the end of the whole Relation of it *Rev. xi.* the Visions are Dramatical; and therefore need no punctual Completion. So that the Doctor has bestow'd a great deal of pains to little purpose in interpreting the Visions of the Book, *Rev. vi.* when it may be all'dg'd, that

that they were exhibited only in a Play or Show, and need no more to be fulfill'd than the Vision of the strong Angel we are speaking of.

The other thing which makes the literal sense of opening the Book in St. *John's* time impossible to be the ultimate sense of that Phrase, is that which is said *Rev. v. 13.* where St. *John* says he heard every Creature in Heaven, in Earth, in the Sea, and under the Earth, saying, *Blessing, and Glory, and Honour, and Power be unto him that sitteth upon the Throne, and to the Lamb for ever and ever.* In which Hymn since every Creature was to be concern'd; if it had been said in St. *John's* time, we should certainly have had some footsteps of it in History. But there is no such Passage any where to be found, and yet it was to be before the Lamb's opening of the Seals, as plainly appears from the uninterrupted order of Relation, *Rev. v. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, &c.* Therefore the true opening of the Seals was not in St. *John's* time.

To this the Doctor answers as strangely as to the former (*Par. Proph. Chap. xxxiv. Resp. ad 10.*) not resolving whether it was to have any Completion, or not, as being Dramatical too; but if it ought to be fulfill'd at all, he says it is not to be till the *Millennium*, as neither that before it at *ver. 9, 10.* where the Beasts and Elders say, they shall reign upon the Earth.

Reply 1. The Text it self says, That that Hymn of the Beasts and Elders was sung upon the Lamb's taking of the Book (which Dr. *M.* makes to be in St. *John's* time) *Rev. v. 8.* And when the Lamb had taken the Book, they sung, &c. according to which account it should have been past these 1600 Years. Likewise the Hymn founded forth by every Creature is put before the Lamb's opening any one of the Seals, as is evident to any one that reads. And is it not very strange that in the same uninterrupted Series of Relation, the Lamb's taking the Book *Rev. v. 7.* should have been done 1600 Years ago, but that the Song said in the next Verse to have been sung thereupon, should not be fulfill'd till the *Millennium*, as neither the Gratulation of the Angels, *ver. 11, 12.* nor the Hymn said by every Creature, *ver. 13, 14.* And that in the very next Verse, *viz. Chap. vi. 1.* there should be a regression to things past 1600 Years ago, as the opening of the Book is said by Dr. *M.* to be? 2. Whereas the Doctor makes it an Argument, that the Song of the Beasts and Elders, *Chap. v. 8, 9, 10.* shall not be fulfill'd till the *Millennium*, because they say, they shall reign upon the Earth; it is plain from those words, *shall reign*, that their Reign

was not then begun ; and consequently, that the Hymn was to be sung before the *Millennium*. 3. The Doctor himself on *Rev. xi. 16.* makes these Elders to be our noble Reformers, who are already dead and gone. Also upon *Rev. xv. 7, &c.* he expounds the seven Angels (to whom one of the said Beasts is said there to give seven Vials) to be half past already. Wherefore the Beast that gave them their Vials must prefigure something before the *Millennium*, which is not yet come. 4. How arbitrary is it, to make in the same Vision, the Beasts and Elders, *Chap. v. 8.* to figure something to come ; but the strong Angel proclaiming, *ver. 2.* to figure nothing at all, (altho in all the Epistles, and in many other places, the *Angels* of the Churches are by the current of Interpreters expounded *Men* ; and ought to be so in all places of the Prophecy, for ought I see yet to the contrary) nor the opening of the Seals to figure any thing here, tho it be never us'd but figuratively in any other place ? But lastly, If the Hymn said by every Creature, *Rev. v. 13.* and that by the Beasts and Elders, *ver. 9, 10.* be not to be sung till the *Millennium* ; it is certain from the unquestionable Order of the Relation, that the Seals are not to be open'd till then neither. For when (that is, soon after) the Lamb had taken the Book, that Hymn which was sung by the Beasts and Elders, is expressly said to have been sung, *ver. 8.* And the Seals were not opened by the Lamb, till he had taken the Book ; therefore the opening of the Book was to be much about the same time with the Song sung by the Beasts and Elders, and cannot by any means be thought to have been fulfill'd 1600 Years before it. Whence it follows, That that Phrase of opening the Book cannot be understood literally, *i. e.* it can't be understood to signify no more, than what was done in the Vision presented to St. John 1600 Years ago. And thus much to prove that by opening the Sealed Book, *Rev. v.* is meant explaining it.

As to the other Point, *viz.* That by the Throne in the Vision I am upon, is meant a Throne of God upon Earth ; because I cannot bring the proof of it within the compass of this Sheet of Paper, I reserve it to another, if God permit. Tho it may seem to be prov'd already, in that, 1. The Throne is plainly one of those things which the Spirit expressly calls things future, *Rev. iv. 1, 2, &c.* Come up hither (says the Voice) and I will shew thee things that must be hereafter (*i. e.* things which are not yet in being ; much less things which have been the same from all Eternity.) And immediately (says the Prophet, as the result of the Voice's calling to him) I was

in the Spirit, and behold, a Throne was set in Heaven, and one sat upon it. Wherefore since it is evident that this Throne was not in being at the time of the exhibiting of this Vision to St. *John*; what can be more plain, than that it is not the Throne of God in the highest Heaven? 2. If by opening the Seals, be meant explaining the Book to the People of God (as I have prov'd it is) then it must needs follow, that the Lamb with seven Horns and seven Eyes, that opens the Book, is not Christ himself in Person, but the Church of Christ (as the Lamb, *Rev. xvii. 14.* is expounded, *Rev. xiii. 7.* and even by reason it self.) For since the time of his conversing with us in the Flesh, we are not to expect that he should come in Person to explain any Book to us. And consequently the Throne, in the middle of which the Lamb is represented, is some earthly Throne.

A Corollary.

If by opening the Book, *Rev. v.* be meant explaining it; then most certain it is, That the time of the Church prefigur'd in that Chapter, is that wherein the Book we speak of, has been or shall be first explain'd. For whereas it is said, That upon Proclamation made, no Man in the World could explain it, *ver. 2, 3.* and when St. *John* wept because no body was found able; *ver. 4.* Presently thereupon an Elder is represented as comforting him with the joyful News of the unfolding of it, in these words, *Weep not, Behold, the Lion of the Tribe of Judah, the Root of David hath prevailed to open the Book, v. 5.* As who should say, Behold, through the assistance of Christ, whose Merits are ever prevalent with God for the good of his Church, I have set forth an Explication of it. Whence it undeniably follows, That the time of the Church prefigur'd in that Chapter, is the very time wherein it would please that Lion of the Tribe of *Judah*, to impart the first true Exposition of that Book to his People. And the Book is the same which the Lamb takes, *Chap. v. 7.* and opens, *Chap. vi.* where also the Contents of it are particularly rehearsed. If therefore that Book be truly expounded (as no doubt it is) already; then is the time prefigur'd in *Rev. v. 5.* past. And the Person that has done it (being one of the four and twenty Elders) was a Member of that glorious Church describ'd, *Chap. iv. 4, &c.* So that that Church, or state of the Church, must needs be come also: which Observation will be of great use to us, when we come to the particular Explication of the Prophecy.



III.

More Arguments to shew, That by the Throne, Rev. iv. & v. is meant a Throne of God on Earth, and not in the highest Heaven. With Answers to Objections.

TO the two Arguments made use of in the former Sheet, to prove that by the Throne, *Rev. iv. & v.* is meant some Throne of God on Earth, and not in the highest Heaven; I now add,

Thirdly, That it is certain, and confest by all Interpreters, that by Heaven in some places of the *Revelation* (as also in other Prophecies of Scripture) is meant an Heaven upon Earth. As in *Rev. xii.* where we have mention of a Woman in Heaven, and of a great Red Dragon there also persecuting her (which Dragon is call'd, at *ver. 9.* the Devil and Satan) and the Woman afterwards flying into the Wilderness, &c. Who can be so senseless as to interpret this Heaven, otherwise than of an Heaven upon Earth, where the Woman (the Church) is persecuted by her profest Enemy the Devil? Since therefore it is so demonstrably certain, that in this Prophecy, Heaven is sometimes taken for an Heaven upon Earth; and it cannot be made out clearly, that Heaven, where it is spoken of as the Scene of any Action, is ever used there in any other sense; it follows, that the Heaven we speak of, *Rev. iv. & v.* is an Heaven upon Earth too; and consequently the Throne there spoken of, an Earthly Throne. But,

Fourthly, If it could be made appear, that Heaven, where it is made the Scene of Action, is any where us'd in this Prophecy for the highest Heaven: Yet here it were a most unreasonable thing to take it in that sense. For then the Sitter on the Throne, with the Book sealed in his Right Hand, *Rev. v. 1.* must be God Almighty. And whereas it is said in the next Verse, that Proclamation was made by a strong Angel, *Who is worthy to open the Book?* &c. In the 3^d Verse, it is return'd thereupon, *That no Man in Heaven, nor in Earth, neither under the Earth, was able to open the Book, neither to look thereon.* The meaning of which (if by Heaven be meant the highest Heaven) must be, That Christ himself was not able

to open the Book, neither to look thereon ; which were most absurd. And the more, because it is certain, that God had given his Son the Revelation, (whereof the Book we speak of is confest to be a part) before ever this Vision was exhibited to St. *John*. For Christ would not have sent his Angel to signify it to his Servant *John*, *Rev. i. 1.* if God had not signified it to Christ before. Wherefore when it is said ; *That no Man in Heaven was able to open the Book* ; the meaning cannot be, that no Man in the highest Heaven, where Christ sitteth at the Right Hand of God, was able ; but it must be expounded (as it is certain that it ought in other places) of an Heaven upon Earth.

To this the Doctor answers, That Christ is excepted ; according as is answered by St. *Paul* in a like Case, *1 Cor. xv. 27.* But I reply, That let the Doctor understand it how he pleases, it is certain that St. *John* did not understand it with exception of Christ, *viz.* as if it had been said, No Man in Heaven, but Christ, was able to open the Book. And this appears from what follows in the *iv. verr.* where St. *John* tells us, *He wept much, because no Man was found worthy to open and read the Book, neither to look thereon.* For if the Sitter on the Throne were God Almighty on the Throne of Glory, with a Book in his Right Hand sealed, how odly would it have look'd in St. *John* to weep, and that much, because no Man but Christ was found worthy to open it ? For whom could he expect or desire should do it besides ? But the Doctor adds (*Par. Proph. Chap. xxxiv. resp. ad 5.*) That St. *John* did not know as yet, that Christ was worthy to open the Book and read it, nor so much as to look upon it. *Repl.* I wonder the Doctor should venture to say so ! For this is to make that great Apostle, and beloved Disciple, a very ignorant Man indeed. For did not St. *John* know the Worthiness and Abilities of Christ, as well as any Man ? The Prophet had cause to weep then indeed, if he were so weak as to think that Christ himself was not worthy to read the Book. But how could he be ignorant of that, which every Christian is suppos'd to know ? Besides, St. *John* must needs have known what the Book was, or else he would not have wept that no Man could open it. But it is confest on all hands, that the Book was part of the Revelation. So that St. *John* of all Men could not be ignorant of Christ's Worthiness to open the Book, when he knew that Christ had call'd him on purpose to communicate it to him.

Object. But if St. *John*'s ignorance of Christ's Worthiness had not been the cause of his Weeping, how comes the Elder, *ver. v.*

to comfort him in these words ; *Weep not ; behold, the Lion of the Tribe of Judah, the Root of David hath prevailed to open the Book?* &c. For by this it should seem that St. *John* did not know that Christ could do it.

Ans. I have before prov'd this Vision to be a Prophecy, and that by *Opening* the Book, is prefigur'd the *Explaining* of it. So that the meaning of the Elder's words is plainly this : Not that Christ in his own Person hath given out an Exposition of the Book, but that some Member of his Church on Earth hath done it, through the prevalence of his Intercession. As if the Elder had said, Behold, I, through the Merits of Christ, have been enabled to Expound the Book. So that the true reason of St. *John's* weeping was, because no Man in this World was found at that time worthy to open the Book ; and therefore Christ is not excepted, because not concern'd, as being not in this World. And thus are those great Absurdities easily avoided, which must needs follow upon making the Sitter on the Throne to be God Almighty ; and the Heaven here spoken of, the highest Heaven ; which can by no means be allow'd to be the sense of this Prophecy.

5. The Sitter on the Throne appears to be a Man, and not God in his own Person, from the description that is given of him, *Rev. iv. 3.* where he is said to be to look on like a Jasper and a Sardine Stone ; whereas God Almighty in his own Person, no Man hath seen at any time, (*1 Tim. vi. 16.*) nor can see. Is it not therefore very absurd, to imagine the Invisible God to be describ'd, by telling us what He looks like ? But now, if we conceive the Sitter on the Throne to be some Representative of God (as a King, or the like) it would be very proper to describe him by the likeness of his Appearance ; and to say that such an one was to look on like a Jasper and a Sardine Stone, would be the properest Description of any. For as much as such Persons are wont to appear upon their Thrones in such Ornaments.

Object. That Hymn, *Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty*, &c. cannot be sung to any Creature, which yet is sung to the Sitter on the Throne, *Rev. iv. 8.* Also the Sitter on the Throne is said to *Live for ever and ever* ; and such Worship and Adoration is paid to him, as cannot be given to a Creature without Idolatry. To this purpose it is Objected by the Doctor, in the xxxiii. Chap. of his *Paralipom. Prophetica.*

I answer, It is a mistake in the Doctor, to say that that Hymn, *Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty*, &c. is said to be directed

to the Sitter on the Throne : Whereas the Text it self has only these words, *And they rest not day and night, saying,* (without expressing to whom 'tis said, leaving us thereby to understand that it is said only to the B. Trinity) *Holy, holy, holy, &c.* The next Verse indeed makes mention of giving Glory to the Sitter on the Throne ; but then the words of that Doxology, are only these : *Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive Glory, and Honour, and Power ; for thou hast Created all things, and for thy Pleasure they are, and were Created,* Rev. iv. 11.

But is it lawful then to use such Expressions as these to any Representative of God ? *Ans.* It is as lawful to use them to a Representative of God, as to use them to a God that looks like a Jasper and a Sardine Stone. For can any thing that in its own Nature and Person looks like a Jasper and a Sardine Stone, be the God that liveth for ever and ever, in a proper literal sense ? And there is an improper Analogical Sense, wherein a King may be said to live for ever and ever, as well as a Man may be call'd Good, or Wise, or Holy. For we know our Saviour says expressly, that *there is none good but God* ; and yet in a reserv'd sense, we commonly call Men good too, without any offence or fault at all. The like may be said of calling Men wise, and holy, &c. And why may not as well the title of *Living for ever and ever*, be attributed to a King ? For it is certain, that there is or shall be a Kingdom in this World, that shall last for ever and ever, *Dan. ii. 44. & vii. 27. Rev. xi. 15. & xxii. 5.* And it is as certain, that the several Kings of any Kingdom ruling successively one after another, are represented in Prophecy but as one King ; as may be seen in many places of the viii. Chap. of *Daniel*, and in *Rev. xvii. 10, &c.* and is confest by all Interpreters. Whence it follows, that as the Kingdom it self is said to continue for ever, so the King of it may as well be said to live for ever ; in what sense the one may be said, the other may be said also. But here it is to be observ'd yet farther, that I do not say that the Sitter on the Throne is not God, but that it is not God in his own Person, but describ'd according as He is pleas'd to exhibit himself glorious in some Earthly Prince. As when, with respect to his delivering his People out of *Egypt*, God is describ'd as having a mighty Hand, and a stretched-out Arm ; not that God in his own Person has any bodily Parts, but this is spoken with respect to *Moses*, whose Hand and Arm God made use of in that Work, making his Hand Mighty, and the stretching-out of his Arm to do Wonders. So that in effect, the Sitter on the Throne is
God

God and the King too, or God working in and by the King, who is here consider'd only as God's Instrument in the Work, for which thanks is given to them both as one, in being given to the Sitter on the Throne. Wherefore the Doxology given to the Sitter on the Throne, (together with the other expressions of Devotion therewith mentioned) is so to be understood as being only by Analogy or Mystery applicable to the Visible Sitter that look'd like a Jasper and a Sardine Stone ; but properly and literally to God Almighty the Invisible *Co-essor* and Director of him.

But the Doctor further urges in the place afore-quoted, that there is no ground for making two Sitters on the Throne. *Ans^r.* If there be ground for making the Sitter on the Throne a good King, there must be the same for making God to sit with him, by his Invisible Assistance and Direction. So that in making the Sitter on the Throne to be a King directed by God sitting with him, I make indeed no more than one Sitter on the Throne ; according as *One* is taken in the holy Scriptures five hundred times, as where we are forbidden to have more Masters than One, and the like. And indeed, if the Spirit has vouchsafed to say of every ordinary Believer, that he is one with God and Christ : How glorious and indissoluble is the Union between God and a good King, whom he vouchsafes to make his Instrument in the Delivering or Protecting of his Church ? So that the making of God and the King to be the Sitter on the Throne, is so far from making two Sitters, that he could not be a good King, unless God were suppos'd to sit with him.

But were it not Idolatry in People to worship God by any Visible Representative of his, sitting in the midst of them, according to the description in *Rev. iv.* where is one sitting visibly in the midst of the Throne, with four ζῶα, (or living Creatures) and twenty four Elders round about him ? *Ans^r.* As to the Vision, there can be no Idolatry in that, because it is but a Vision, and no real thing. And as to the Completion of it, we must not think that the Prophecy is to be understood in that gross manner, as if it were never to be fulfill'd, till the Persons signified by the Living Creatures and Elders should get together about a Throne, paying their most profound Devotions to one looking like a Jasper and a Sardine Stone, sitting in the midst of it. But the meaning is only to shew the Order of the Hierarchy, the Person sitting in the midst of the Throne, being the Supreme Visible Governour ; the Living Creatures in the midst of the Throne, and round about the Throne, next under him ; and the 24 Elders under them. In which
Order.

Order (not Local, but Political) or Subordination one to another, the Inferiours pay their duties to their Superiour, and all of them to that good God, who invisibly presides in the midst of them.

Object. But the Doxology we speak of, *Rev. iv. 11.* is address to the Sitter on the Throne for his *Creating of all things*, and how then could any Mortal have an hand with him?

Ans. In the Language of the Prophets, any notable alteration of Affairs, is call'd a New Creation. And as for the term of *all things*, it is very often said not of * all things Universally, but of those things only which had been the subject of the foregoing Discourse. Which Points being confest by all Interpreters of Scripture (so far as I know) will need no further proof. And thus have I vindicated the Sitter on the Throne to be a Man, and consequently the Throne to be an Earthly Throne. I proceed,

6. The Throne appears to be an Earthly Throne also, by the Company that are gather'd about it. For these are call'd *ζῶα*, Living Creatures, and Elders; which are Names we never find given to any but Mortals. And it is a very dangerous thing, for the sake of an Hypothesis, and to serve a Turn, to depart from the constant and unquestionable use of Words, by affixing private and unwarrantable Interpretations to them. These Persons are also prov'd to be Mortals, by the Incense they are represented with, *Rev. v. 8.* which is a Type of the ascending up of the Prayers of the Church from Earth to Heaven. From whence Dr. *Hammond* upon the place infers, that the Persons using it, are the Church on Earth. And he infers the like from what they say of themselves, *ver. 10.* that they were made to God Kings and Priests, and that they should reign upon the Earth. For this description can neither agree to Angels, nor to Souls departed. But if the Company about the Throne be Mortals, the Throne must needs be an Earthly Throne. And since mention has been made of the Famous and Learned Dr. *Hammond*, I crave leave to add, That he is so far from scrupling to interpret the Sitter on the Throne to be a Man, that he makes him not so much as a King, but only a Bishop. For which, see his Annotations on *Rev. iv. 2.* and I look upon Dr. *Hammond* to be as good a Judge as any Man of what Interpretations are *safe*, tho' not so always of what are *sound*. But to return to our purpose,

7. The *New Jerusalem* is a City that was to be on Earth, as appears from *Rev. xxi. 2.* where it is said to come down from God out of Heaven. The same is said of it again at *ver. 10.* where also St. *John* is carried up but to an high Mountain to see it; so that it must needs

* To which purpose the Reader may observe, that in the Original it is, οὐκ ἔκτισται, not πάντα, absolutely (ut) τὰ πάντα, which the Learned know, is more easily liable to this sense, than to any other; as if it had been said, For thou hast created πάντα, all these things. Vid. *lexx.* in *par. c.* 6.

needs be an Earthly City : And if it came down from God out of Heaven (as is said of it) whither could it come but to the Earth ? Accordingly we find it said at *ver.* 24. That *the Kings of the Earth do bring their Glory and Honour into it.* And at *ver.* 26. *They shall bring the Glory and Honour of the Nations into it :* From whence it is very plain, that the *New Jerusalem* was to be a City on Earth. But now, in *Rev.* xxii. 3. The Throne of God and the Lamb is said to be in the *New Jerusalem* ; which Throne of God and the Lamb, is the same with that we are speaking of, as will appear from *Rev.* v. 6. where the Lamb is represented in the midst of it. And therefore the Throne we speak of is an Earthly Throne, as being in an Earthly City.

8. Lastly, For sail, Dr. *M.* himself, against whom I unwillingly dispute all this while, confesses the 24 Elders to be a Type of our Noble Reformers, *i. e.* of Mortals : See his *Apoc. Apocalypseos* upon *Rev.* xi. 16. whence it follows, That the Throne about which they are represented in the Vision, must be a Type of an Earthly Throne. Nay, and even this the Doctor has asserted too (tho he now seem to have forgotten it) or else what mean those words of his upon *Rev.* vii. 9. *After this I beheld, and lo, a great multitude which no Man could number, of all Nations, and Kindreds, and People, and Tongues, stood before the Throne, and before the Lamb.* Namely (says the Doctor) before the Throne above (*viz.* in *Chap.* iv. & v.) described in Heaven : For John (he adds) *is supposed to see all these Visions in Heaven, tho they concern things here on Earth.* Of which words, the plain meaning is, That altho the Vision represents these things in Heaven, yet they are to be fulfill'd in things on Earth. And what is this but to grant, that the Throne seen in Heaven in the Type, is in the Antitype an Earthly Throne ? And so much for proof, that by the Throne, *Rev.* iv. & v. is meant an Earthly Throne.

I shall therefore conclude this Point with a further Illustration of it, taken from that ἀντίστοιχα, which is easie to be observ'd between the Sitter on the Throne we speak of, and the Dragon with Seven Heads and Ten Horns, described *Rev.* xii. Concerning which Dragon, it is confest by Mr. *Made*, Dr. *More*, and all the best Interpreters, that thereby are meant the Pagan Persecuting Emperours of *Rome*, the profest Enemies and Opposers of the Church of Christ. Notwithstanding which consent of Interpreters, the Holy Spirit himself tells us, at *ver.* 9. that this Dragon is the Devil and Satan. And yet the Prophecy mentions but one such Seven-headed Dragon neither. So that it must necessarily follow,

follow, according to them, (and indeed according to the truth it self) that by the Dragon is represented both the Pagan Emperours as Instruments, and Satan as the prime mover of them, by whose Instigation and Assistance, they became so active in endeavouring the Churches Ruine: The Emperours were the visible Dragon, actuated and set on work by Satan the invisible.

The Reddition or Application of this to the Sitter on the Throne, is obvious. For by Interpreting the Sitter on the Throne to be a King, (notwithstanding that the Prophecy sets him forth as God) I do no more make two Sitters on the Throne, then they who expound the Dragon to be a King (notwithstanding that he is said to be the Devil) make two Dragons. And as the things spoken of the Dragon there, are applicable to Satan as the prime Mover, but to the Emperours as his Instruments; so the things spoken of the Sitter on the Throne, are applicable to God as the first and principal Cause of all, and to Men employed by him in the Service, only as Instruments and second Causes. And I would fain know whether the nature of the opposite Relation that there is between two Princes, the one a violent Persecutor and profest Enemy of the Church, and the other as zealous a Defender of it, do not oblige, that as the one is represented like the Devil and Satan, whose work he does; so the other should be represented like God, whose Image, Instrument and Representative on Earth he is. According as we find Interpreters to agree in the Exposition of the Man-child, said to be caught up to God, and to his Throne, *Rev. xii. 5.* for they expound it generally of *Constantine the Great* (as I took notice before.) And if other Scriptures are found to lie so high in the setting forth of Kings, as to call them Gods; much more may we expect them to be describ'd as such in this Book of the *Revelation*, which must be confessed for loftiness of Expression, to exceed all others in the Sacred Volume.

F I N I S.

